

REMARKS

The present application includes claims 1-9. Claims 1-9 have been rejected by the Examiner. By this Response, claims 1 and 6 have been amended.

Claims 1-9 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,643,086 (hereinafter Alcorn) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,003,507 (hereinafter Johnson). The Applicant incorporates the comments provided in the previous response dated September 11, 2007, and provides the following additional reasons for traversal of this rejection.

As previously discussed, Alcorn stores a casino game and casino game authentication program. However, as agreed upon by the Examiner, Alcorn does not disclose the emulation of an erasable programmable read-only memory (EPROM). Further, as explained in the background of the present application, in the Alcorn apparatus, the software inspects itself and renders a verdict as to its own authenticity. Self-verification and the potential for compromised security at the point of manufacture render the Alcorn technique a generally unacceptable practice in the gaming industry. In addition, Alcorn's apparatus cannot be used with a Kobiltron or other external EPROM-compatible authentication device. Thus, Alcorn, which relates to internally authenticating software using an RSA technique on data stored using mass storage media other than EPROMs (e.g., a hard drive), fails to disclose the apparatus and method of the presently pending claims.

To more particularly address the points raised in the Office Action, the Applicant respectfully disagrees that Alcorn relates to read-only memory (ROM). In fact, the techniques of Alcorn allow game data and an authentication program to be stored on a

hard drive or similar readable/writable memory. Further, the “message digest” of Alcorn is described as a value produced using a hash function on the casino game data set. See, e.g., Abstract. That message digest is then encrypted to generate a signature that is stored on the mass storage device. See, e.g., Abstract. That signature is then retrieved and decrypted for comparison to a message digest from the game data being executed. See, e.g., Abstract. If a match exists, game play is permitted; if a match does not exist, game play is prohibited. See, e.g., Abstract. See also col. 7, line 26 – col. 8, line 25. Thus, the message digest of Alcorn represents the values used in authentication and not any sort of reporting program or functionality as recited in the presently pending claims.

Further, while Alcorn discloses a video subsystem 22, there is no discussion in Alcorn of providing a presentation program and a selection program in the context of retrieving information and isolating a subset of V-PROM contents based on user input as recited in the presently pending claims. See, e.g., col. 6, lines 58-63.

The test circuit for paging EPROMs of Johnson, which uses hardware switches and SRAMs rather than software constructs on a storage medium to form an EPROM simulator, fails to provide any additional elements to combine with Alcorn to arrive at the inventive combination of elements recited in the pending claims. As shown in the Office Action, other than mention of EPROM emulation, Johnson provides no particulars with respect to the presently claimed limitations to suggest otherwise.

Neither Alcorn nor Johnson teach, suggest, or motivate the presently claimed apparatus and method which are compatible with current gaming authentication hardware but which can also avail themselves of the advantages of new and future storage technologies. Although Alcorn discloses a method for ‘authenticating’ software stored in

mass media, it ignores the existing authentication paradigm presently expected in the gaming industry, which expects a set of EPROMs for “system” software and a set for each model (including a unique pay schedule, symbols/graphics, and/or pay rules), or a set for each game in a multi-game environment.

For at least these reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-9 should be allowable over the cited art of record.

CONCLUSION

In general, the Office Action makes various statements regarding the pending claims and the cited references that are now moot in light of the above. Thus, the Applicants will not address such statements at the present time. However, the Applicant expressly reserves the right to challenge such statements in the future should the need arise (e.g., if such statement should become relevant by appearing in a rejection of any current or future claim).

The Applicant submits that the claims define allowable subject matter and are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or the Applicant can be of any assistance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to contact the Applicant at the number below. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any necessary fees or credit any overpayment to the USPTO Deposit Account MHM, Account No. 13-0017.

Respectfully submitted,

/Christopher N. George/
Christopher N. George
Registration No. 51,728
Attorney for Applicant

Date: May 7, 2008

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60661
Telephone: (312) 775-8000
Facsimile: (312) 775-8100